



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/806,303	03/22/2004	Paul Hepworth	3271.2.26	1818
21552 7590 10/07/2010 AUSTIN RAPP & HARDMAN 170 South Main Street, Suite 735 SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84101				
EXAMINER				
SEYE, ABDOU K				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2194				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/07/2010		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

usptocorrespondence@austin-rapp.com

Response to Rule 312 Communication	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/806,303	HEPWORTH ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Abdou Karim Seye	2194

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

1. ☒ The amendment filed on 16 September 2010 under 37 CFR 1.312 has been considered, and has been:

- a) ☐ entered.
- b) ☐ entered as directed to matters of form not affecting the scope of the invention.
- c) ☐ disapproved because the amendment was filed after the payment of the issue fee.

Any amendment filed after the date the issue fee is paid must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.313(c)(1) and the required fee to withdraw the application from issue.

- d) ☒ disapproved. See explanation below.
- e) ☐ entered in part. See explanation below.

The amendment changes the scope of allowed claims 33-34 and 41, since in the following statement of claim 33 "if the attempt to connect the object identifier reader to the host computing device is unsuccessful or if the attempt to send the image of the object identifier to the host computing device is unsuccessful" the claim is limited to only one condition being met by the if statement instead of the the two conditions; and similar changes have also been made to claims 34 and 41

/Hyung S. SOUGH/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2194
09/30/10